



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE MOSAIC NAMES OF GOD, AND WHAT THEY DENOTE.

METHOD OF TRANSCRIPTION.

In transcribing ancient Hebrew and its more recent vowels as accurately as possible into English letters and sounds for those who know the latter only, the following facts had better be stated:

1. The 22 letters of the Hebrew alphabet are all consonants, none of them vowels, not even the letter A, which is voweled with any Hebrew vowel as needed. The evidence which I adduce of this fact is, that there is no word in the Hebrew consisting of but one letter, because if there were one it would have had to be a vowel.

2. The earliest record of a system of vowelizing and correct reading of the Scripture was made in Babylon in the first half of the sixth century A. D. The evidence of this is, that not an intimation of a name, or character of a vowel is to be found in the vast literature of either the Jerusalem or the Babylonian Talmuds. There is reference there to certain points which are traditionally obligatory to be put over the letters of a certain few words in the books of Moses which are written for ritual reading, but not for articulating purposes. What they really are for no one can tell us. But very ancient these point are, for they are attempted to be accounted for in the Siphri, a commentary to Numbers, which antedates all the Talmuds. (See § 69 to Num. ix. 9, 10.) The publication of the Talmuds in the written form was not done earlier than the sixth century, and perhaps not earlier than the seventh.

3. The six letters of the Hebrew alphabet, B, G (hard), D, K, P, T, which are mutes, (because, as Max Müller aptly said, you can not sing with them) can not close a syllable or a word. The reason is that the organ with which either of these is pronounced must first be closed and then suddenly opened, hence to pronounce another following consonant next to it, the closing and opening would have to be repeated, and fluency of speech and the ease of hearing would be hindered. These six mutes are therefore capable of being aspirated, i. e., pronounced with their respective organ of speech somewhat opened, so that the breath is allowed to pass through the organ. We shall use the small *h* in connection with the respective capital letter to denote this aspiration, and shall give the corresponding sound in our transcribed letter of the Hebrew alphabet.

4. The Hebrew has a few letters of double sound, but expressed with one letter. However, in transcribing them, we shall use the English capital letters doubled.

5. Avoiding refined niceties we shall transcribe Hebrew vowels in the following English vowel values: *a*, as in "far"; *o*, as in "not"; *ai*, as in "main"; *i*, as in "pin"; *ee*, as in "keen"; *e*, as in "get"; *ou*, as in "house"; and *oo*, as in "poor."

6. The Hebrew writes and reads from right to left, but in transcribing we shall write and read from left to right and place the vowels after capital consonants in small letters at the top.

7. The initial letter of the name of a Hebrew letter indicates its sound thus:

HEBREW FORM	NAME	ENGLISH TRANSCRIPTION	ENGLISH SOUND	REMARKS
א ב ג ד ה ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת	Aleph	A	(See 1.)	It may sound like any vowel in 5.
	Baith	B	B	
	Vaith	Bh	V	One of the aspirable letters.
	Ghimel	G	G	Hard.
	Ghimel	G	G	Like <i>g</i> in the German <i>Tag</i> , which becomes our <i>y</i> in "day."
ו ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת	Daleth	D	D	The aspirations of ך and ם are not minded.
	Dhaleth	D	D	Should sound like "th" in "with."
	Hai	H	H	
	Vov	V	V	Ancient Greek Digamma = 2 Gammas, <i>F</i> , one above the other, $2 \times 3 = 6$, the 6th in the Alphabet.
ז ח ט י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת	Zaïn	Z	Z	Just the English, not the German <i>z</i> .
	HHeth	HH	HH	The nearest existing English sound to represent this letter with.
	Teth	TT	TT	The sound of this T is never changed.
י כ ל מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת	Yod	I	Y	Consonant as in "Yes."
	Kaph	K	K	This K can be aspirated,
	Khaph	Kh	Kh	as in "Kherson" a Russian town. At the end of a word its shape is ך in modern Hebrew.
	Lamed	L	L	
מ נ ס ע פ צ ק ר ש ת	Mem	M	M	At the end of a word its shape is ם in modern Hebrew.
	Noon	N	N	At the end of a word its shape is ן.
	Samakh	S	S	This S sound is never changed.
	GHayen	GH	GH	A palatal and guttural sound combined.
	Peh	P	P	This letter can be aspirated as in ם.
	Phe	Ph	Ph	At the end of a word the shape is ף.
	TSadik	TS	TS	Like German <i>z</i> , not like English <i>z</i> . At the end of a word the shape is ץ.
				This Q sound never changes.
ק ר ש ת	Kooph	Q	Q	
	Raish	R	R	
	Shin	Sh	Sh	
	Sin	SS	SS	
	Tav	T	T	
	Thav	Th	Th	Like in "with."

BY birth, education, and religious conviction I was and am deeply interested in the destiny of the Jewish nation. The strange phenomenon, therefore, that the

Christ and Christianity, which are so undeniably of Jewish origin, should yet have been and are generally rejected by the Jews, engaged my attention ever since I recognized in Jesus of Nazareth Him of whom Moses and the prophets and Psalms so often speak. What was the efficient cause of that intense Jewish ecclesiastical animosity against Him whom Christians regard, and therefore worship, as the incarnate Son of God? Such a tremendous national event as the cruel crucifixion of the innocent Christ has proved itself to have been, could not have taken place without a previous preparation. Why then did the Jewish authorities cause the crucifixion of our Lord Jesus by the Roman authorities? Events of such moment in history are pragmatic and not accidental. But was not this event in fulfilment of prophecy? Yes, but the X-rays with which prophecy penetrated the then thick veil of future ages, and photographically faithfully described that horrible, and world-changing event of the crucifixion would yet not have done so if it were not to take place. Prophecy, though it is anterior, is yet a consequence and not a cause of the event it describes. The prophecies of the fifty-second and fifty-third chapter of Isaiah were not the cause but the consequence of the unjust trial, condemnation, crucifixion and burial of Jesus the Christ of Jehovah, the God of Israel.

What then was the cause of that ecclesiastical rage against him? Some assume it was the new paths in the ritualistic practices which Jesus struck out, for instance in the observance of the Sabbath and in the washing of hands before meals. But at the time of Christ these were not as yet established laws, but rather matters of dispute among the differing rabbinical schools. And even if they had been then established laws, they would have been too inadequate in their breach to be the cause of the Jewish authorities bringing Jesus to the cross, and to have secured

his death by the Roman governor at the humiliating acknowledgment of having no king but Cæsar, thus going back on their pride of ages, which they expressed in their numerous daily benedictions that Jehovah was their God, their Father and their King.

The doctrine of the divine Sonship of the Christ was at the time of our Lord Jesus either not entertained at all by the Jewish ecclesiastical authorities, or it was relegated to the esoteric teachings of divine mysticism, the H^aN-NⁱST^o R^{ou}TH,¹ "hidden things" of Deut. xxix. 28, and which are alluded to in Jewish post-Biblical literature, and some of which have come to us by the name of the Kabalah. So entirely was the doctrine of the divine sonship of the human Christ repressed from the public teachings of those times, that the books of Ezekiel and Daniel in which a human being is represented in the one as the leading power in the throne of God, and as a Son of God in the other, were designed by the ecclesiastical authorities to be put out of the canon, and relegated among those books that were to be "concealed" from the public, the GNV^{oo}SiM,² from which word we have the translated word "Apocrypha," and to which *we* attach the additional meaning of "ungenuine."

But some ideas about the divine sonship of the Christ must have been entertained by the people. This is evident from what Matthew relates in his Gospel, xxii. 42-46. On one occasion when he met a number of Pharisees, Jesus asked them what they thought about the Christ as to whose Son He was. They promptly answered "David's." Then Jesus cited to them in refutation of their reply, the 110th Psalm, the title of which LD^oVⁱD^s = By David, denotes that David was the author of it. There David says, that Jehovah (for whose name the Jews substitute the word A^aD^{ou}N^oI)⁴ said unto my Lord A^aD^{ou}N^{ee}I,⁵ "sit thou at

¹ הַסְתֵּרֹת² גִּנְזָיִם³ לְדָוִד⁴ אֲדֹנָי⁵ אֲדֹנָי

my right hand until I put thine enemies as a footstool under thy feet." How then, asked Jesus, can he, the Christ, who was admitted by the Jews to be meant by that word A^aDouN^{ee}I, i. e., "my Lord,"—how then can He, the Christ, be the son of David, if David calls Him "my Lord"? For there was no question that it would be an indignity to a father to call his own son "my Lord." Then Matthew relates that the Pharisees were completely silenced, and dared not ask Him any more questions. They must have felt that Jesus struck the most vital point in dispute between them, viz., the divinity of the Christ. And in the passage which our Lord Jesus quoted, the difference there between Him and the Pharisees turned about the pronunciation of the word spelled ADNI,⁶ which they pronounced A^aDouN^{ee}I,⁷ meaning "my Lord," while he must have meant it to be pronounced A^oDouN^oI,⁸ meaning "Milord," which word with this pronunciation is applied in the second Psalm to the Son of Jehovah.

For those who are not familiar with the Hebrew language, the important point made here by me will not be readily understood. To such, however, I would propound the question: How did our Lord Jesus Himself answer the question, which He proposed to the Jews? There can be no denial, that the Divine Sonship of the Christ was the vital point of the controversy between our Lord Jesus and His opponents, the Scribes, the Pharisees, and the Sadducees. We see this in the gratification of our Lord at Peter's confession (Matt. xvi. 16), "Thou art *the* Christ, *the* Son (not *a* Son) of the living God!" Then the Lord's declaration: "Blessed art thou Simon bar Jona, because flesh and blood has not revealed unto thee, but my Father who is in the Heavens. Moreover I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, but on this stone, ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ, (not ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῷ πέτρῳ) I will build my congregation." Put-

⁶ אדני⁷ אדני⁸ אדני

ting this in the Palestinian dialect of that time, it would have this paranomesia: P^eTR^o A^aNT V^eGH^aL A^aBh-N^oA D^eD^oA A^eBhN^eH KN^eS^{ee}I^oH SH^eL^{ee}I.⁹ We see it also in the "grand adjuration," the HH^eR^eM H^aGG^oD-V^{ou}L¹⁰ of the high priest at the trial (Matt. xxvi. 63), "Art thou the Christ, the Son of God?" then our Lord's reply, "Thou hast said." Then declaring the amazing doctrine of the Incarnation he said: "Moreover (L^eBh^aD)¹¹ I tell you, [addressing the whole council] from now on ye shall see the *Son of man*" [i. e., the Christ as the Incarnation of the Son of God] sitting at the right hand of the Power," L^{ee}IM^{ee}IN H^aGGBh^{oo}R^oH etc.¹² This the high priest declared as blasphemy, which it would be if there were no Son of God, or better say *in* God, and no incarnation of that Son in a human form, B^eN A^oD^oM.¹³ But neither was this fatal blindness of the Jewish Rabbis and ecclesiastical authorities without an adequate antecedent cause. What was it? It may be put as a proposition to all I intend to say in this paper, that the monotheism maintained in Judaism from post-Biblical times on to this our own day, is not the monotheism of the Jewish "sacred books," KⁱTHBh^{ai} KV^{ou}D^eSH.¹⁴

What then do these books teach about God? I answer, we can learn this from the names of God found in these books, in connection with other things which they say of God. Names in Hebrew are not arbitrary, meaningless, but there is much in a Hebrew name, for it denotes the character, or some event that happened, or some quality that it is desired to express in the person bearing the name. Hence the names of God which the author of any Old Testament book makes use of, give us legitimately a clue as to what that writer holds about God.

I have gone systematically through the books of Moses.

⁹ פִּיטְרָא אֱנֹתִי וְשֵׁל אֲבָנָא דְרָא אֲבָנָה כְּנִסְכָּה שְׁלִי: ¹⁰ הָרִם בְּקוֹל ¹¹ (לְבָד) ¹² לִי מִיָּן בְּנִבְיָה ¹³ בֶּן אָדָם ¹⁴ כְּתָבִי קוֹדֶשׁ

and of Joshua, and the other books of the Old Testament in order to find out what their authors say of God. But on the present occasion time will not permit to review every passage in detail, and I must satisfy myself to call attention to the most salient points.

It will not be denied successfully, that the Hebrew language existed prior to the advent of Moses. Julius Fürst in his ZⁱKhR^{ou}VN^{ou}VTH LSh^{ou}VN Q^{ou}DeSh¹⁵ = "Memoirs of the holy tongue" appended to his concordance of the Old Testament, dates the Hebrew language to the time of GH^eBh^eR,¹⁶ (Eber, Gen. x. 21, 24, 25,) the grandson of Shem. And this agrees well with the national name "Hebrew," GHⁱBhR^{ee}L.¹⁷ At any rate Moses was not the inventor of the Hebrew language. Yet it will not be denied that he must have had a decided influence on the culture of that language during the latter part of his active life. Or, take even the lowest view of the lowest self-styled "high critics" of modern times, and assume that Moses is a mythical person, and that the books reputed as his work were the composition of some Exilic, or post-Exilic prophet, priest, fanatic, or erratic, and it will not be successfully denied, that whoever the author, compiler, or conglomerator be, he must have had an influence on the culture of the Hebrew language by virtue of that composition. And if so, then the question arises, how came he to use the name of God AeL^{ou}H^{ee}IM¹⁸ in the plural, "Gods," and with verbs in the singular number with but few exceptions? Whoever and whenever the books of Moses originated, he or they always used, for there always were, names of God in the singular number that could have been equally as well used as the plural AeL^{ou}H^{ee}IM. This plural is evidently formed from the singular AeL^{ou}VH^a;¹⁹ and it would be begging the question to say that this AeL^{ou}VH^a belongs to a later Hebrew,

¹⁵ זְכוּרֹנֹת לְשׁוֹן קִדְשׁ

¹⁶ עֵבֶר

¹⁷ עֵבְרִי

¹⁸ אֱלֹהִים

¹⁹ אֱלֹהִים

for surely the plural of a noun would never originate before its singular form. Nor can the plural A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM²⁰ be derived from the monosyllabic A^eL,²¹ for its plural is A^{ai}-L^{ee}IM,²² from which is derived the derisive A^eL^{ee}IL^{ee}IM,²³ i. e., "false gods, idols." The H, therefore, in A^eL^{ou}-H^{ee}IM²⁴ is evidence enough that the singular A^eL^{ou}VH^a²⁵ is a most primitive Hebrew word for the name of God.

In passing let me call attention to a remarkable cautiousness against error in the spelling of this word A^eL^{ou}-VH^a. In the fifty-six times that this name occurs in the Old Testament it is always, except twice, (viz. Deut. xxxii, 17, IⁱZBH^{oo} L^aSh^{ai}D^{ee}IM L^{ou}A A^eL^{ou}H^a,²⁶ "They sacrifice to Devils, not a God," and Daniel xi. 38, VL^eA^e-L^{ou}H^a M^oGHV^{oo}Z^{ee}IM GH^aL K^aNV^{ou} IKh^aB^{ai}D²⁷ = "And the God of Fortresses he will honor on his pedestal") spelled with a Vov, while in the many hundred times of the plural A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM²⁸ derived from this A^eL^{ou}VH^a²⁹ in the singular there is not a single instance of its being spelled with a Vov. Why? Because when spelled A^e-L^{ou}H^a³⁰ the Hai³¹ might have been taken, before the Hebrew vowel points were invented, as the feminine formative Hai,³² with an o³³ sound preceding it, from the masculine A^eL,³⁴ and thus a goddess, an A^eL^oH,³⁵ might have been thought to exist in the Hebrew faith. To prevent this possible error the spelling with a Vov³⁶ was introduced, and the word is spelled in what is grammatically called the *plene* form. The plural A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM³⁷ can not therefore be derived from A^eL³⁸ directly, but from A^eL^{ou}H^a³⁹ indirectly. Why then did the author, authors, redactors, conglomerator or conglomerators of the Mosaic books use the plural but not the singular for the name of God, and

²⁰ אֱלֹהִים ²¹ אֵל ²² אֱלִים ²³ אֱלִילִים ²⁴ אֱלֹהִים ²⁵ אֱלֹהִים
²⁶ וַיִּזְבְּחוּ לֵאלֹהִים אֲחֵרִים ²⁷ לֵאלֹהִים מְעֻזִּים עַל בְּנוֹ יִצְחָק ²⁸ אֱלֹהִים ²⁹ אֱלֹהִים
³⁰ אֱלֹהִים ³¹ הָאֵל ³² הָאֵל ³³ הָאֵל ³⁴ אֵל ³⁵ אֱלֹהִים ³⁶ וְ
³⁷ אֱלֹהִים ³⁸ אֵל ³⁹ אֱלֹהִים

with this plural, verbs in the singular? And this we find in the very first three words of the Mosaic Scriptures. "In [or 'at'] the [or 'a'] beginning Gods *He* created," not "they created"? Can such a glaring error, as a noun and its verb *not* agreeing in number be unintentional? For whatever else may not agree in this disagreeing world, a verb must agree with its noun in number and gender. Can this be a mere *usus loquendi*? Can this be without an adequate reason? Especially when in a few instances this same plural noun AeLouHeeIM⁴⁰ is used with verbs in the plural? It would seem that nothing but preconceived notions can assume this in order to make it tally with these ideas. One of these is the notion that Moses or the Mosaic books teach an absolute, mathematical one-Godism, which is but a mere notion and not a truth. What this intentional, ungrammatical use of the plural noun AeLouHeeIM = Gods, with verbs in the singular number, can and certainly does teach is this, that God, or Deity, is not an absolute mathematical unit, but such a plural unity that a verb in the singular can be used with his plural name AeLouHeeIM = Gods. And in this sense it is a Hebrew *usus loquendi*. There are some Hebrew nouns used exclusively in the plural form, some of which are used with verbs in the singular, while others of the same kind are used with verbs in the plural only: HH^aI-IeeIM⁴¹ = "lives" = "life," is always used with plural verbs, except perhaps once, in Ps. lxiv. 2, MiPaHH^aD AouVI^{ai}Bh TiTSouR HH^aII^oI,⁴² "from the fear of the enemy Thou wilt preserve my life," if TTSR⁴³ should be voweled rather TaiTSaR⁴⁴ from IoTSouR⁴⁵ = "to distress," and not from NoTSouR⁴⁶ = "to preserve," which is in better parallelism, with PaHH^aD⁴⁷ = "fear." Sh^o-MaIiM⁴⁸ = "heavens" is always in the plural. MaIeeM⁴⁹

⁴⁰ אֱלֹהִים⁴¹ חַיִּים⁴² מִפֶּחַד אֵיכָב הַצָּר חַיִּי⁴³ הַצָּר⁴⁴ הַצָּר⁴⁵ יָצַר⁴⁶ יָצַר⁴⁷ פֶּחַד⁴⁸ שָׁמַיִם⁴⁹ מַיִם

= "waters" is always with a plural verb except eight times of the four hundred and forty-six times that the word occurs in the Old Testament, where it occurs with other verbs in the singular number. $R^aHHM^{ee}IM^{50}$ = "mercies" = "mercy," is so far as I can find always with verbs in the plural number. $SR^oPh^{ee}IM^{51}$ and $TR^oPh^{ee}IM^{52}$ are always with plural verbs. Most pertinent to the subject under consideration is the special plural or dual proper name $Mi^tTSR^aIiM^{53}$.

This name of the land, in the dual form because it appertains to upper and lower Egypt, is also used to denote the inhabitants of Egypt who otherwise are spoken of as $Mi^tSR^{ee}IM^{54}$ = "Egyptians," and in the singular $Mi^tSR^{ee}I^{55}$ = Egyptian. The dual plural proper name Mi^tSR^aIiM when applied to the inhabitants of Egypt is used both with verbs in the plural and singular number. Thus Gen. xlv. 2, "And he put forth his voice, and they, Mi^tSR^aIiM (Egyptians), heard it." Gen. xlvii, "And all Mi^tSR^aIiM (Egyptians) came to Joseph." Ex. i. 13, "And Egyptians (Mi^tSR^aIiM) lamented [for] him." Ex. iii. 9, "The oppression which Egyptians (Mi^tSR^aIiM) oppress them." Ex. vi. 5, "...the groanings of the Bne Israel, whom Egyptians (Mi^tSR^aIiM) enslave." Ex. vii. 5, "And Mi^tSR^aIiM (Egyptians) shall know." In all these passages Mi^tSR^aIiM might have been voweled Mi^tSRiM^{56} , and the agreement of the plural noun with the plural verb would have been perfectly correct. But we have again Ex. xiv. 10, "...and behold Mi^tSR^aIiM (Egyptians) $NouSaiGH^a^{57}$ = *he* travels after them." Again Ex. xiv. 25, "And Mi^tSR^aIiM (Egyptians) *he* said ($VaIIAouMeR^{58}$) $A^oNV^{oo}So^{59}$ = "*I* will flee before etc." Here the common version is very wrong in rendering $A^oNV^{oo}So^H$ in the plural, "Let us flee," following as usual the

⁵⁰ רַחֲמִים	⁵¹ שָׂרָפִים	⁵² תְּרָפִים	⁵³ מִצְרַיִם
⁵⁴ מִצְרַיִם	⁵⁵ מִצְרִי	⁵⁶ מִצְרַיִם	⁵⁷ נָסַע
		⁵⁸ וַיֹּאמֶר	⁵⁹ אֶנֶסָּה

LXX which have here *φύγωμεν*. This is one of those numerous instances where this version professes to be a "*translation from the original*" and is not so, but a second-hand translation from a prejudiced translation. Again Jer. xlv. 8, MiTSRaIiM (Egyptians) KaIAoR IaGHaLeH,⁶⁰ "*he shall go up like a river.*" Here the people might be called by the name of the land, were it not that MiTS-RaIiM⁶¹ is feminine, as e. g. in Joel iv. 19, "MiTSRaIiM⁶² *she shall be waste,*" while IaGHaLeH⁶³ above is masculine. Again Ps. cv. 38, "MiTSRaIiM SSoMaHH⁶⁴ (Egyptians) *he was glad when they went.*"

Now in all *these* places vowel point instead of MiTS-RaIiM, Egyptians in the dual number, MiTSRiM,⁶⁵ Egyptians in the plural number, and the disagreement between plural nouns with singular verbs becomes grossly apparent. Yet it is done because the word MiTSRaIiM in the dual plural stands for the collection of the plural persons of the nation Egypt, who can logically and linguistically be regarded as one person and therefore be spoken of in connection of verbs in the singular number. And just so the case may be with the word AeLouHeeIM⁶⁶ although it is an indubitable plural, yet because the persons of this plural have an intimate bond of union they can logically and linguistically be spoken of in connection with verbs in the singular number.

If now what I have said up to this point be true, and I think it is, then the old contention between the non-Christian and the Christian Jew must therefore be not merely whether AeLouHeeIM is, or is not, a *pluralis excellentiae*, a sort of an editorial "*wegotism,*" nor why it is used with verbs in the plural number in comparatively few places, but the contention must be as to why this plural word AeLouHeeIM is used in hundreds of places with verbs in

⁶⁰ מִצְרַיִם בְּיַד יְעֻזָּה

⁶¹ מִצְרַיִם

⁶² שְׂמָמָה תִּהְיֶה

⁶³ יְעֻזָּה

⁶⁴ מִצְרַיִם שָׂמָח

⁶⁵ מִצְרַיִם

⁶⁶ אֱלֹהִים

the singular? The un-Christian Jew, whether orthodox or heterodox, cannot explain this on any grammatical or rhetorical grounds. The truth that A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM is a plural of abstraction will not help the question, for a plural of abstraction would not be used if the object from which the abstraction is made were not a plurality.

At this point I want to ask my attentive readers what bearing think ye, has *my* contention on the very confidently talked-of theory of an Elohist redactor of some portions of the, at least reputed, writings of Moses? What might have been his trend and bent of mind? And may not the very much denied Moses have been himself that Elohist, who wanted to teach the unity of persons in the plurality of the Godhead? We shall see about this further on.

What I wish to touch upon next is the equally confidently talked-of Jehovistic redactor of some parts of the at least reputed writings of Moses. There can be no doubt, according to my showing above, that the intention of Moses or of the hypothetical pious fraud of a redactor of his reputed writings, was to teach a plurality in the unity of Deity. What monotheism then did the true, or pseudo, Moses teach? An unprejudiced reader of the Mosaic writings, one for instance who would come down from the moon, or perhaps more likely from Mars, such a one would certainly come to the conclusion that the writings teach a mono-Jehovism. The meaning of Deut. vi. 4, ShM^aGH IⁱSR^oA^eL I^eHV^eH A^eL^{ou}H^{ai}NV^{oo} I^eHV^eH A^eHH^oD⁶⁷ is, "Hear, O Israel, our Jehovah of Elohim (Gods, Deity) is one Jehovah," i. e., there are no two Jehovahs in Deity. And so too is the meaning in the BⁱLTⁱ⁶⁸ = *absque* = "without," and BⁱLGH^oDaI⁶⁹ = *Sine* = "without" in connection with A^{ai}N A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM,⁷⁰

אין אל'הים⁷⁰ כקערי⁶⁹ בלתי⁶⁸ שמע ישך אל יהוה אל'הינו יהוה . . .

“without I^eHV^eH⁷¹ there is no Deity,” not “besides” = *praeter*, so often met with in the Prophets.

In the first record of the creation, in Gen. i. 1 to ii. 4, the Creator is A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM = “Gods.” Of these the record mentions one as the R^{oo}V^aHH A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁷² = “Spirit of Gods” (i. 2). In the creation of man this record says that “A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM (= Gods) He said: Let *us* make an A^oD^oM⁷³ in our own image, like our likeness.” The word A^oD^oM⁷⁴ is evidently the masculine form from which the feminine A^aD^oM^oH⁷⁵ = “earth” is formed as a word, and is in the singular number. Then this record says: “And A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁷⁶ (= Gods) *He* created the Adam in His image, [i. e.] in the [one] image of A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM (= Gods) created He him: male and female created He them” (i. 26, 27). Adam’s female’s name was not derived from his name, but both the male and the female were spoken of in this record as A^oD^oM.⁷⁷ This is more distinctly stated in the record of v. 2, “Male and female created He them, and blessed them, and He called them Adam in the day of their being created.” So we see here again, that a plurality of persons can be called by a name in the singular number, just as we have seen before in the case of the plural name A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁷⁸ being used with verbs in the singular number. Nevertheless the difficulty here of leaving the human female without a name, or with a masculine one is not as easily overcome as in the case of A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM, which has its analogy in the plural name MⁱTSR^aIⁱM,⁷⁹ being also construed with verbs in the singular. Moreover this linguistic difficulty is intimately connected with the theological difficulty, that this record implies that there is a female in the plural Godhead. And besides these linguistic and theological difficulties there is yet the greatest cosmic difficulty with this first record.

יְהוָה⁷¹ רוּם אֱלֹהִים⁷² אֱלֹהִים⁷³ אֱלֹהִים⁷⁴ אֱלֹהִים⁷⁵
 אֱלֹהִים⁷⁶ אֱלֹהִים⁷⁷ אֱלֹהִים⁷⁸ מַצְרִים⁷⁹

According to it everything in this world of ours is good and very good, yet we find in it toil, sorrow, pain, misery and death. Whence came all these? The deponent of this first record says not! However, our Elohist Moses solves for us all these difficulties with a supplementary record, which extends from Gen. ii. 4 to the end of chapter iii. And this supplementary record does *not* contradict the preceding one, but only supplements it.

[It is said by certain critics, that Gen. i. 11, 12, which speaks of vegetable production contradicts ii. 5, 6, which says that there was no vegetation at the creation. This contention is the result of a misconception, which in turn is the result of a mistranslation. Verses 5 and 6, of chapter ii, should be rendered thus: "The following are the events of the heavens and the earth at their being created, in the day of Jehovah of Elohim's making earth and heaven, and before any fine grass of the field had come to be in the earth, and before any herb of the field had sprouted, for Jehovah of Elohim had not yet caused to rain upon the earth, and an Adam there was none to work the soil, [i. e., by irrigation]. But a vapor would ascend from the earth, [i. e., from the places where there were moisture and water] and would cause all the face of the soil to drink it up." So this record is merely a further explanation of how vegetation came about after the dry land, the $IaBoSH^oH$,⁸⁰ appeared out of the waters, which gathered into one place. Another contradiction is claimed to exist between i. 20-25, which speaks of the creation of the land animals *before* the creation of man, and ii. 19 where it says that animals were created *after* man was created. This contention is simply a piece of ignorance; the $V^aI^iTS^eR$ ⁸¹ of the latter verse does not mean at all "and He created" but "and He gathered," from TS^oRouR ⁸² = "to gather," hence $V^aI^iTS^eR$ ⁸³ with one Iod, and not like $V^aII^iTS^eR$ ⁸⁴

⁸⁰ יבשה⁸¹ וַיַּקַּח⁸² קָרַר⁸³ וַיַּצַּר⁸⁴ וַיַּיָּצַר

in verse 7 with two Iods, where it *does* mean “He created,” from I^oTS^{ou}R⁸⁵ = “to create”].

The Deity who is brought to our reverent notice in this record as the actor of wonderful deeds is not A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM, but I^eHV^eH A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM,⁸⁶ and in subsequent scriptures this appellation becomes the most solemn one. The natural and logical meaning of the two words in the English language is “Jehovah of Gods,” and so in Joshua xxii. 22 the tribes of Reuben, Gad and part of Manassah are recorded to have so understood it by their adjuration A^eL A^eL^{ou}-H^{ee}IM I^eHV^eH⁸⁷ = “God of Gods Jehovah”! The name I^eHV^eH is treated throughout the Old Testament Hebrew, (and this is all of the pure Hebrew we have,) as a proper name, for (*a*) it never has the definite article before it, and (*b*) it has never the pronominal suffixes attached to the end of it. Those two marks distinguish it from the divine names A^eL, A^eL^{ou}VH^a and A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM,⁸⁹ which are not proper, but appellative names. And inasmuch as the rule in Hebrew Old Testament onomastics is that a person bear and be named by only one name, therefore this double or counterpart must be regarded as being in the constructive genitive case, namely, Jehovah of Elohim, or Gods. But Jewish superstition—not Hebrew, for there is no superstition in the Hebrew Scriptures—Jewish superstition starting, most probably, with a laudable reverence for the name of Jehovah, ended with a total suppression of that name, of which the bearer of it said: “This is my name forever, and this is my memorial for generation and generation. (Ex. iii. 15.) Instead of I^eHV^eH the Jews say A^aD^{ou}N^oI.⁹⁰ And the Creator, whose is whatever is in the universe by virtue of His and only His creative power, is denied that power by a superstitious ignorance

⁸⁵ יְצַר⁸⁶ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים⁸⁷ אֱלֹהִים יְהוָה⁸⁸ אֱלֹהִים⁸⁹ אֱלֹהִים⁹⁰ אֲדֹנָי

that calls Him by the title "Lord," which denotes mere *acquired* possession.

This degenerated reverence for the name of the Creating Father of all, together with a false monotheism, became perpetuated by the Jewish Greek translation of the Old Testament, the so-called Septuagint, where I^eVH^eH A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁹¹ is rendered *Kύριος ὁ θεός*. And this Jewish traditional superstition has become and is the property of all Christendom! But this is not all. A similar superstitious tradition inherited by Christendom from post-Biblical Rabbinism, is the translation of A^aD^{ou}N^oI I^eH-V^eH⁹², which the Jews pronounce A^aD^{ou}N^oI A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁹³ and which Christians following them translate "Lord God," while the true meaning of it is: "Milord of Jehovah."

Let me give here the results of my studies as to the meaning of these sacred names. I have already given the inevitable meaning of A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM as a plural.

The meaning of the sacred name I^eHV^eH, according to Mosaic narrative in Exodus iii, was not known till Moses, to whom Jehovah Himself explained it, although the personal Deity and the name was known before to the Hebrew patriarchs as far back as Seth and Enosh. The explanation came about in the following manner (verse 11): Moses said to *the* Deity H^oA^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM that spake to him from the burning thorn-bush: "Who am I that I should go to Pharaoh, and that I should bring forth the children of Israel from Egypt?" (verse 12.) And He (the Deity) said: "For I will come to be with thee, and this be for thee the sign that I have sent thee, when thou shalt have brought forth the people from Egypt ye shall worship *the* Deity A^eTh H^oA^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM⁹⁴ by his mountain [otherwise an unlikely thing, for it, Horeb, is out of the road to Palestine]. (Verse 13) And Moses said to the

יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים =

אֲדֹנָי יְהוָה⁹²

אֲדֹנָי אֱלֹהִים⁹³

אֵת יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים⁹⁴

Deity H^oA^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM, "Behold I am coming to the children of Israel, and have said to them the Deity of your ancestors has sent me unto you, and they shall have said to me: 'What is His name?' What shall I say to them?" And Deity = A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM He said to Moses: "I will become that I will become." And He said: "This shalt thou say to the children of Israel: 'I shall become has sent me unto you.' " (15) And Deity moreover said to Moses: "Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel: 'Jehovah of the Deity A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM of Abraham, of the Deity of Isaac, of the Deity of Jacob sent me unto you'! This is my name forever, and this is my memorial for generation and generation." The meaning, therefore, of I^eHV^eH is A^eHI^eH A^aSh^eR A^eHI^eH⁹⁵ = "I shall become that I shall become," not "I am that I am," for the Hebrew language has no word that corresponds to our verb "to be," and where it is needed it is simply implied and not expressed, and therefore you find it in your English Common Version in italics. And when you do find it there in common print (Roman) it must be rendered from the original Hebrew "to become," for pray tell me what comfort would it have brought to the toiling Hebrew slaves of Egypt to be told that "The I am" sent a message to them? They would have said there was no assurance in that name that He can or will do anything for *us*. And how different when the name of the message-sender is "I shall become that I shall become"! That means that he will become whatever they will need, their leader, their Redeemer, their defender, their provider. Or take an example of a later age of the Hebrew language as to the verb H^oI^oH⁹⁶ and its meaning. Take Isaiah lxvi. 1, 2: "Thus saith Jehovah, the heavens my throne and the earth footstool of my feet; which a house that ye would build for me? And where a place of my rest? And all these things my hand hath

⁹⁵ אֶהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶהְיֶה יְהוָה

⁹⁶ הָיָה

made, and they all became; thus the oracles of Jehovah." Put instead of "became," "have been" as you have it in the common version, and the force of the argument is gone, for if all these *have been*, then he needed not to have made them. The verb H^oI^oH occurs about 3354 times in the Old Testament and of these only eighteen times in the passive NⁱHI^eH.⁹⁷ Take your English concordance and look for the word "become" in the Old Testament and except in Deut. xxvii. 9, where it is in Hebrew NⁱHI^eH, the Hebrew is H^oI^oH. I know that this idea about the Hebrew verb H^oI^oH is comparatively new. I grasped it, I think, a short time before Heinrich Ewald's grammar, seventh edition, came to my hands, and I was glad to have such an authority. (See also Dr. Ernst Meier, *Hebr. Wurzelwörterbuch*, s. v. H^oI^oH, p. 80: "Die Hebräer haben nicht einmal ein Wort was den Begriff des Seins streng ausdrückt.") And this is an immense truth, reaching far into the documents from which and in which we have our Christian faith. It makes one of the steps of the liberation of the study of the Hebrew language from the swaddling clothes in which Rabbi David Kimchi first swaddled it, and in which Rabbi Elijahoo Bahhur (Elias Levita) presented it to the reformers of the sixteenth century, and from which we have yet to be emancipated. It seems that the Hebrews who formed their language repudiated the idea that anything can exist *per se*, but all has to become, hence they had no need of a verb "to be." The sacred name I^eHV^eH means, therefore, "He shall Become," the second Iod in the third person fut. IⁱHI^eH becoming changed into the V^oV⁹⁸ of the infinitive H^o-V^{ou}H.⁹⁹ And notice that the name of Himself which He gives us and commands us to know and remember Him by implies that He does not give it to Himself but it is given by another than Himself, and does not mean "I

97 נִהְיָה

98 יִהְיֶה

99 הָיָה

shall become," but "*He* shall become." And it implies that He was in all that humanly is called past, for He is to become in the human future, not merely to begin to be in that future, but become whatever the creatures He made will need Him to become.—Ah, my friends! This is the Sh^eM H^aMMP^{ou}R^oSh,¹⁰⁰ the Tetragramaton, of which some people speak with ignorant awe and superstitious worship, while there is here a λογική λατρεία (Rom. xii. 1), a reasonable intelligent worship.

In this connection I must mention the objection which some critics make against the idea that the patriarchs before Moses knew at all of Jehovah because the record in Ex. vi. 3 says, "And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac and unto Jacob by God Sh^aD^{ai}I,¹⁰¹ but by my name I^eHV^eH I became not known to them." The objection rests on the word N^{ou}VD^aGHTⁱI,¹⁰² which is in the passive form (Niphal) from the active (Kal) I^oD^aGH.¹⁰³ But this passive form is here a reflexive. This is analogous to the passive and middle voices in the Greek language, whose grammatical structure is so much more elaborate than the Hebrew. Similar reflexives in the form of passives are the NⁱDB^aR¹⁰⁴ in Mal. iii. 16, Ezek. xxxiii. 30 and Ps. cxix. 23. So too are the passive participles R^aHHV^{oo}M and HH^aNV^{oo}N,¹⁰⁵ the last in Ex. xxii. 26, and both in xxxiv. 6, and often. Also the passive NⁱSh-B^aGH,¹⁰⁶ invariably for "he swore," hence only reflexive, "he adjured himself."

A similar superstitious tradition which "makes the words of God of none effect" like the threefold false rendering of I^eHV^eH AeL^{ou}HeeIM with the words "Lord God," is the post-Biblical Rabbinical pronunciation of A^aDouN^oI I^eHV^eH with A^aDouN^oI AeL^{ou}HeeIM. This false pronunciation was inherited from the Jews by all

¹⁰⁰ שֵׁם הַמְּקֹדֶשׁ

¹⁰¹ שְׁרִי

¹⁰² נִדְבַחְתִּי

¹⁰³ יָדַע

¹⁰⁴ נִדְבַח

¹⁰⁵ חָנֵן and רַחוּם

¹⁰⁶ נִשְׁבַּע

Christendom, and you perpetuate it by translating it "Lord God," while you should render it "Milord of Jehovah"!

The first instance where we meet with this compound name of God is in the theophany which Abram had, recorded in Gen. xv. 2. Jehovah said to him, "Fear not, Abram, I am thy shield, thy reward is very great," (SKh°RKh° H°aRB°eH MA°ouD°107), not "I am thy great reward." And Abram said, "A°aDouN°oI I°eHV°eH (= Milord of I°eHV°eH) what wouldst thou give me? etc., etc." And again in verse 8, "A°aDouN°oI I°eHV°eH by what shall I know that I will inherit it?" Then again in the theophany of the three men, chap. xviii, Abram addresses Jehovah with A°aDouN°oI alone. My impression is also, that neither Abraham nor Moses, when they had a theophany, have addressed Jehovah by that name directly, but always either coupled with prefixing A°aDouN°oI, or with it itself. Different from this is the address in prayer: This distinction may prove of great importance to Biblical exegesis and Christian doctrine. For the question arises: How can a theophany be reconciled with the declaration of Jehovah to Moses, "Thou canst not see my face, for the Adam could not see me and live," (Ex. xxxiii. 20) and yet in the same chapter (verse 11) it is said: "And Jehovah would speak to Moses face to face as a mortal man (A°e°ISh°108) would speak to his friend." And again in Num. xii. 6, 7, 8, when Jehovah chided Aaron, and chastised Miriam for their maladversion against Moses, He said, comparing his intercourse with other prophets, with the intercourse He had with Moses: "Not so is my servant Moses: in all my house is he a trusted one. Mouth to mouth I would speak to him, (B°ouV)* and a visibleness (V°ooMa°RA°eH)°109 is there, and not with riddles, and the figure (TM°ooNa°TH)°110 of I°eHV°eH he would look at." Has Jehovah a figure? It would be exegetically very un-

107 שְׂכָרְךָ בְּרָכָה קֵאֵר

108 אִישׁ

* בִּי

109 וּמֵרָאָה

110 הַמּוֹנֵת

scientific to fall back with this difficulty upon the present fashionable convenient theories of different “relators” and “redactors” of this, that, and the other part of the polychromic Penta-, or Hexateuch. If you identify the person of I^eHV^eH with that of A^aD^{ou}N^oI and translate these two names as they stand together, as though they were in apposition, then the difficulty referred to is insurmountable. But remembering that the ancient Hebrew never gives to one person more than *one* name, and recognizing the evident distinction between these two different names, and that they can not, therefore, be in apposition, but in the constructive genitive case, if you will translate A^aD^{ou}N^oI I^eHV^eH “Milord of Jehovah,” you will then see the harmony of those very Scriptures which some people have torn to pieces and assigned the pieces to different and differing persons and ages,—you will see them given from one Shepherd, ay, for His sheep that know His voice.

But first of all, (*a*) What is the meaning of A^aD^{ou}N^oI? and (*b*) How does it differ from A^aD^{ou}N^{ee}I? The consonants are the same, the vowel points alone differ. It would be exegetically unscientific to accord implicit authority to the great and small Massorahs in their pointing or vowelizing of this word ADNI¹¹¹ one way here and another way there throughout the Old Testament. I have previously called attention to our Lord’s disproving the correctness of the massoretic pointing of these four letters in Psalm cx (see pp. 392 ff.). At the same time I would be the last on earth to disparage the invaluable services of the Massorahs. All I contend for is the old rule of literary freedom: “*non jurare in verbo magistri.*” What then (*a*) is the meaning of A^aD^{ou}N^oI, and (*b*) how does it differ from A^aD^{ou}N^{ee}I? This last is certainly from the noun A^aD^oVN¹¹² = “Lord” with the first person of the possessive pronoun, and means, therefore, “My Lord.” This

אֲדֹנָי אֲדֹנָי

English word is a corruption of the Anglo-Saxon *Hlaf-weard*, i. e., "keeper of the loaf." This is far from the idea of Creator, or Eternal Being. To this word A^aDou-N^{ee}I no pronouns are suffixed, but to the same consonants when pointed A^aDouN^oI we find all possessive pronouns affixed, proving it, therefore, to be an appellative name, treated linguistically in some respects like the divine appellative name A^eLouH^{ee}IM. Similar, too, this is to the now quaint usage of the English "My Milord, thy, his, her Milord, or lords." The first instance of this compound divine name in the Old Testament is in the case of Abram (Gen. xv. 2, 8). Abram says to a vision of Jehovah speaking to him "A^aDouN^oI I^eHV^eH, What canst Thou give me, etc., etc.?" and again "A^aDouN^oI I^eHV^eH by what shall I know that I will inherit it?" Elsewhere Abram addresses Jehovah with A^aDouN^oI alone. (Why is there not a theory of Adonaists?) Now keep in mind clearly that this A^aDouN^oI is a human title applied to God, and that in its meaning it refers to *acquired* possession, that it differs, therefore, in meaning from the names A^eLouH^{ee}IM and Jehovah which are applied to the Creator, then ask yourself what could Abram have meant by putting these two names together? Or, take even the basest views of the highly destructive critics, and grant for the sake of argument, that this record about Abram and Jehovah is a mere myth that never really took place. But surely the record did not write itself, what then did that mythograph mean by putting this double name in the mouth of Abram? Take in the situation: Abram, the old Aramic sheik, had just returned from a brilliant military expedition, in which, with his three hundred and eighteen "initiates" (HH^aN^{ee}IKh^oIV)¹¹³ he pursued a number of invading kings with their armies, who went off with the booty of the defeated kings of Sodom and Gomorrah, his

neighbors. On his way back with that booty the king of Sodom went out to meet him, and with the king came also Melchizedek, king of Sholem, who was at the same time, it is said, priest to the High God. •This king and priest saluted Abram with bread and wine in token of proffered covenant and friendship. Now listen to their theological talk. Melchizedek blesses Abram and says: "Blessed be Abram to High God, purchaser of heavens and earth. And blessed be High God who unshielded thine enemies with thy hand." Upon this Abram gives the king-priest the tenth of all the booty except the recaptured persons. Abram refuses to accept, and solemnly swears saying: "I cause my hand to be lifted up to Jehovah the High God purchaser of heavens and earth, if I take anything, etc., etc." Abram makes here the pointed confession in the presence of the priest to High God, that to him, (Abram) this High God is Jehovah, whom they say to be the purchaser of heavens and earth. I say *they*, not Abram, for in all the subsequent history of Abram, and even of all his posterity there is rarely to be found that they regard the High God Jehovah as purchaser but almost always as maker of heavens and earth and all there is in them. But brilliant as this exploit of Abram was, he evidently feared an attack of the same kings he defeated. For Jehovah appears to him in a vision, telling him not to fear, for his (Abram's) reward is very great. Then Abram says to Jehovah, "A^aD^{ou}N^oI I^eHV^eH what canst Thou give me, while I am childless," etc., etc. Then follows the wonderful covenant between Abram and Jehovah, which was to be sealed in the body by Abram and all his posterity. What could this juxtaposition of a name denoting an obtainer or acquirer, to a name applied to the Creator, only mean? Can it mean anything else, but that together with Jehovah there is also another Deity, who is an obtainer or acquirer of heaven and earth? This became a mystery of many

subsequent ages. This obtainer appears in the long and eventful history of the Abrahamic posterity as the worker (MaLA°Kh,¹¹⁴ from ML°Kh°H¹¹⁵ = "work," not from the hypothetical L°A°Kh¹¹⁶) of Jehovah. He is an inter-mediating Deity between Jehovah and His people. This double appellation, A°DouN°I I°HV°H is very rare in the early part of the Old Testament, while A°DouN°I alone is very frequent. The double is found once in Joshua vii, 7, twice in Judges, vi. 22, xvi. 28, thrice in 2 Samuel vii, 18, 19, 20, twice in one Psalm, lxxi. 5, 16 (evidently a Davidic Psalm), five times in Isaiah, xxviii. 22; l. 7, 9; lxxv. 13, 15 (very significantly Christian), once in Jeremiah, xlv. 26, where the prophet in the name of Jehovah calls it ShM°eI H°GG°DV°uL = "my great name." Then we meet it innumerable times in Ezekiel and the minor prophets. The mystery of that name, which cannot be rendered grammatically any other way than "Milord of Jehovah," does not become cleared up as to who that person A°DouN°I is till we read of him in the second Psalm. And if this untitled Psalm is an Exilic, or post-Exilic one, it is one more evidence of how much the Jews learned about the true God and His Christ in that short exile, apart from their radically unlearning there their old hankering after the worship of idols. Let us read together this second Psalm:

1. "Why raged the peoples, and nations meditated vanity?

2. "Together stood themselves up Kings of the earth, and secretaries consulted, against Jehovah and His anointed.

3. "Let us remove *their* [Jehovah's and His Anointed's] bands, and let us throw away from us their ropes.

4. "He that sitteth in the heavens will laugh, [who is he?] Milord A°DouN°I will deride them. [Compare this with Isaiah lxxv. 13]

¹¹⁴ מְלָאךְ

¹¹⁵ מְלָאכָה

¹¹⁶ מְלָאךְ

5. "When He [Milord] would speak to them in His anger He would overwhelm them.

6. As for me (A^aD^{ou}N^oI) I have libated my King [i. e., poured out the royal dedicatory libation] upon Zion my holy mount. I (A^aD^{ou}N^oI) will declare the decree Jehovah said to me: 'Thou (A^aD^{ou}N^oI) art my son, this day I (I^eHV^eH) have begotten thee.'

You see the mystery is cleared up; A^aD^{ou}N^oI is the son of I^eHV^eH the Father; He is His Son from eternity but is born in time, and as a time-born individual, He has to ask. Therefore:

8. "Ask of Me (I^eHV^eH) and I will give peoples as thine inheritance [i. e., inalienable possession, according to the law of Jubilee], and thy stronghold ends of earth.

9. "Thou wilt pasture them (TⁱRGH^{ai}M), (com. Rev. ii. 27: *Καὶ ποιμανεῖ αὐτοὺς ἐν ῥάβδῳ σιδηρᾷ*) with a rod of iron; like a potter's vessel thou shalt break and scatter them.

10. "And now Kings!

11. "Serve ye Jehovah with awe, and rejoice tremblingly.

12. "Kiss *the* son [B^aR, a noun that has no plural] lest He (I^eHV^eH) become angry and ye lose a way [for you have to go back to Him, but how?]. For if His anger kindle even but a little—blessed are all they, who trust for protection in Him, the Son."

Further comment is unnecessary, adoration of this revealed mystery is in place.

Finally let me sum up:

1. A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM, the plural of A^eL^{ou}VH^a, shows by the prevalent use of the verbs in singular with it, that it denotes a unity in plurality. H^oA^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM refers to I^eHV^eH.

2. I^eHV^eH A^eL^{ou}H^{ee}IM means "Jehovah of Elohim," and to translate it "Lord God" is a threefold error: (a)

Gives the Creator an inferior title, (*b*) makes a singular of a plural, (*c*) makes an apposition of a constructive case.

3. I^eHV^eH is the name of the Father, whose son is A^aD^{ou}N^oI = "Milord," and therefore A^aD^{ou}N^oI I^eHV^eH must be rendered "Milord of Jehovah."

4. The inevitable bearing these linguistic restorations must have upon the theories of Jehovist and Elohist.

5. The Jews pray to A^aD^{ou}N^oI the Son, yet they do not know Him; how long shall they remain in ignorance?

EPHRAIM M. EPSTEIN, M. D., A. M.
CHICAGO, ILL.